

### REMARKS

Claims 15, 16, and 36-60 are now pending in the application, claims 1-14 and 17-35 having been canceled and claims 36-60 having been added by the above amendment. Support for the new claims can be found throughout the specification. For example, support for new claims 36 and 38 can be found, *e.g.*, at page 22, lines 20-21 and 13-14, respectively; support for new claims 37 and 57 can be found, *e.g.*, at page 26, lines 13-15; support for new claim 40 can be found, *e.g.*, at page 20, line 27 through page 21, line 3; support for new claim 41 can be found, *e.g.*, at page 21, lines 23-30; support for new claim 42 can be found, *e.g.*, at page 22, lines 1-7; support for new claims 43 and 44 can be found, *e.g.*, at page 19, line 4; support for new claims 45 and 46 can be found, *e.g.*, at page 20, line 26; support for new claims 47 and 48 can be found, *e.g.*, at page 21, lines 3-4; support for new claims 49 and 50 can be found, *e.g.*, at page 21, line 30 through page 22, line 1; support for new claims 51 and 52 can be found, *e.g.*, at page 22, lines 7-8; support for new claims 53-60, can be found, *e.g.*, in original claims 15 and 16, at page 22, line 13 through page 23, line 12, and at page 26, lines 13-15. No new matter has been added.

Applicants elect the invention of Group VIII (amended claim 15 and new claims 36-60). The election, however, is made with traverse.

The Examiner states at page 9 of the Restriction Requirement that (*inter alia*) the inventions of Groups VIII and IX are unrelated. The Examiner characterizes the claim of Group VIII (claim 15) as an *in silico* method that utilizes only empirical data, and characterizes the claim of Group IX (claim 16) as an *in vitro* method that uses physically defined, real world organic material. The Examiner concludes that there is no way to actually physically use the different groups together. Applicants disagree with this conclusion.

The Examiner cites MPEP 802.01 and 806.06 as stating that inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects. MPEP 806.06 provides examples of method claims that would be unrelated: "A process of painting a house and a process of boring a well would be...[an] example." Clearly the steps of claims 15 and 16 are not so unrelated as to be categorized as independent inventions. Claim 16 depends from claim 15, and the steps of claim 16 are in addition to the steps of claim 15. Contrary to the Examiner's apparent

conclusion, the steps of claim 16 are not unrelated to the steps of claim 15. Step (c) of claim 16 requires obtaining the agent identified in step (b) of claim 15. Thus the steps of claim 16 and claim 15 are related, and can indeed be practiced together. Furthermore, if the restriction is allowed to stand, a claim including all four steps (such as new claim 56) could never be examined. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the restriction of Groups VIII and IX be withdrawn, and that claims 15 and 16 as well as new claims 36-60 be examined as a single group.

No fees are believed to be due. However, any necessary charges, or any credits, should be applied to Deposit Account No. 06-1050 referencing Attorney Docket No. 16163-004001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 21, 2006

Allyson R. Hatton  
Allyson R. Hatton, Ph.D.  
Reg. No. 54,154

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906